

H 4478

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 11, 1987

cause, and my colleagues in the House to join me in supporting National Child Support Enforcement Month and renew our commitment to fight the scandal on nonpayment of child support.

#### BROOMFIELD AMENDMENT TO INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT

(Mr. INHOFE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot of negative criticism. Here is something positive for a change.

Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago the House approved the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal 1988, which includes an important amendment offered by Congressman BROOMFIELD. The amendment requires the Department of Defense to review and assess the Soviet electronic espionage capabilities from the new Soviet Embassy on Mount Alto here in Washington. This comprehensive assessment will give us a firm basis upon which to take action regarding occupation of the new Soviet Embassy.

There is no question that the new Soviet Embassy is uniquely situated to carry on electronic surveillance and espionage in ways that were not properly appreciated at the time the Mount Alto site was approved. If in fact Soviet occupation of the Mount Alto Embassy compromises United States national security—which it clearly does—then such occupation should not be permitted. Particularly in light of Soviet degradation of security at the new U.S. Embassy in Moscow, there is absolutely no reason for us to continue to live with the consequences of the foolishly mistaken embassy agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the action of the House in accepting and passing the Broomfield amendment. We must retard rather than accept Soviet electronic espionage in our Nation's Capital.

#### CONGRESS MUST ENACT A HOUSING REAUTHORIZATION BILL

(Mr. MANTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, today the House will resume consideration of H.R. 4, the Housing, Community Development, and Homelessness Prevention Act of 1987. This is one of the most important pieces of legislation the House will consider this year.

Mr. Speaker, America is in the midst of a housing crisis. More than 2 million Americans, many of them young children, are homeless. In New York City, families with children comprise 76 percent of the homeless population.

Across the country waiting lists for housing assistance continue to grow as the supply of affordable housing continues to shrink. One-half of those low-income families who have been fortunate enough to find housing are paying more than 60 percent of their income for rent.

Mr. Speaker, there is no mystery to the basis of our housing crisis. Since 1981, the Reagan administration has slashed Federal housing support by more than 60 percent. Funding for assisted housing has fallen from \$26 billion in 1981 to just over \$10 billion this year.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to reaffirm the Federal Government's historic commitment to provide safe, decent, affordable housing for all Americans. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 4.

□ 1040

#### PENTAGON MUST APPRISE CONGRESS WHEN PROBLEMS ARISE IN A MORE TIMELY MANNER

(Mr. ROLAND of Connecticut asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROLAND of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, yesterday it was revealed in the Committee on Armed Services that one-third of our silo-based MX missiles are not operable. The problem is due to severe delays in the contractor's delivery of the guidance system, called the IMU. As a matter of fact, the problem has gotten so bad that the Air Force has terminated all payments to the Northrop Electronics Division and a number of investigations are also in progress.

Delivery problems aside, it has also become known that of the 36 guidance systems which have been delivered to the Air Force, 14 did not work and had to be returned to Northrop for repair. Also, a number of Government agencies are following up on numerous charges of fraud and abuse by the contractor.

I bring this up because the situation endangers our national security. It raises very serious questions about our military capabilities. I must also note that the Air Force has become aware of this situation several years ago and yet they failed to notify the committee until just recently.

I believe this Congress deserves better. I believe the American people deserve better. I think the time has come to enact legislation which places a very strict and firm reporting timetable over which the Pentagon must apprise our committee when problems arise with defense contractors.

#### SUPPORT H.R. 4, HOUSING BILL

(Mrs. BOGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Housing, Community Development and Homelessness Prevention Act. This is important legislation that is long overdue. There has been no major housing legislation enacted for the past several years and, during this same period, we have experienced, as has been pointed out, a dramatic 60 percent reduction in funding for housing and community development activities.

It is critical, at this point, that the authorization process be reactivated to give important policy direction. The bill addresses serious needs for affordable, decent housing for the poor, the elderly, the disabled, and the homeless and it offers assistance in the attainment of homeownership.

It is time for positive action rather than the negative tearing apart of our Nation's commitment to housing. It is time to reassert the importance of housing Americans in decent, safe, and sanitary housing—a commitment made in the 1949 Housing Act. I congratulate the chairman and the members of the Housing Subcommittee and dedicated staff members on an excellent and much-needed bill.

#### CONGRATULATIONS, MRS. SCHROEDER

(Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I make this as a note of congratulations to a Member on the opposite side of the aisle. I, as many of the other Members, read in the paper that another Member of the House is thinking of running for the Presidency. We already have the chairman of the Democratic caucus and the chairman of the Republican conference running for the Presidency and I think that speaks well for the House. But I also think it speaks well for the gentlewoman from Colorado to be considering such a run.

She and I do not agree on many, in fact most, issues. But I welcome the presence of a woman candidate just as I welcome the presence of such people as Elizabeth Dole, Jeane Kirkpatrick, and Senator Nancy Kassebaum on our side of the aisle.

And I say this carefully: that as of yet, while every candidate talks about the new generation and the baby boomers it is wise to remember that half of that generation are women and that the candidates who will address the concerns of women—and they are the concerns of the economy, the concerns of a safe Nation, but, yes, the concerns of family, future and careers—will make a difference. Whatever the decisions of the gentlewoman from Colorado, she does us all a service by having another Member of the House so honored and I offer that from the other side of the aisle.

June 11, 1987

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 4477

task is the preservation of our freedom.

### HOUSE NOT SERIOUS ABOUT BUDGET RESOLUTION

(Mr. LOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, this is not April 15; it is not May 15; it is almost June 15. Where is the budget resolution?

Nobody seems to be able to find it. It is still in conference, I guess, with no apparent hope of a conference report being received anytime soon.

As a matter of fact, in this morning's news media, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget seems to be indicating, well, we will just both proceed, the House on its own little course, and the other body on its own course with no budget resolution.

I realized at the beginning of the year that the Democrats were not going to work and agree with Republicans on budget numbers, but I am becoming more and more amazed, not amused, that Democrats cannot even agree among themselves.

The House Democrats are saying, we want to devastate defense, and we want the Members to agree in advance to raise taxes.

Even the Democrats in the other body will not go along with it, and yet what is happening here in the House. Yesterday we had an opportunity to save \$1.7 billion in housing, to try to deal with the budget deficit. This House would not go along with it.

I am afraid that is what is going to happen all year long. The budget resolution will be ignored, even if we should ever have one. We just waive the limitations from the Committee on Rules, if we need to, and go forward spending as we always do.

It is obvious that our colleagues here in the House on the Democratic Budget Committee are not serious about budgets or deficits.

### SOME MEMBERS SERIOUS ABOUT BUDGET PROCESS

(Mr. COELHO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, I am intrigued with comments from the other side of the aisle about the budget process, particularly from individuals who are commenting about the inability of House Democrats to reach a budget.

The gentlemen on the other side of the aisle that have commented know, as well as I do, that the Republicans on the Committee on the Budget refuse to even submit a budget to be considered. The Members refuse to be a part of the process; and when there were votes, the Members voted present. The Members did not note yes or no. These Members basically

have withdrawn from the budget process.

These Members have withdrawn from the need to resolve the deficit issue. These Members have withdrawn from the need to make sure that we get this Government moving again and get this country moving again. These Members are not interested in that process, but interested in political rhetoric, in standing up and beating out the fact that we are trying to come to a conclusion in this process. We are serious about it.

The Members know it, and we know it. The Members are just frustrated because they have an inability on their side of the aisle to reach an agreement on some type of budget resolution. They have yet to present one.

We are intrigued, we are intrigued with their cheap advice.

### WHERE ARE THE DEMOCRATS IN THE BUDGET PROCESS?

(Mr. BUECHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, I am a little bit stunned at the remarks of the gentleman from California. Were the lights on behind, and if the gentleman was able to look at the names of the Members of the House and been able to count those names, I think the gentleman would understand that there are more Democrats than there are Republicans. When you are in the minority, and you come up with wonderful ways in which to handle the budget, and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] just pointed out that there was an effort yesterday to save money on housing, and every time on this floor that there has been an effort to save money, the majority, which is the Democrat Party, I would remind the gentleman from California, the majority has rejected those attempts to save money.

The budget process is a joke. To ask, where is the budget, is to also say, where is America's fiscal policy. It frankly should be on the floor of this House, but unfortunately it is hidden in Chambers over in the other body where the majority party of the House and the other body has met covertly.

The people of America want to know what taxes are you going to raise. The people of America want to know, are you going to make any spending cuts. When the President's budget came out months ago, the majority party castigated it, said you are going to cut this and this and this.

In reality, what the majority party said was, we do not know what is going to happen, but we want to promise more. When we asked to lead, America gave the Democrats both Houses.

The real question is not where are the Republicans in the budget process. It is, Will you straight-shoot with the American people? The real question is,

Will you tell them what taxes you are going to raise? The answer is, not now.

The question is, Where are you going to save money? The answer is, not now.

The real question is, Where is the majority party; and the answer is, hidden away, not out here, not on television, not in the press, but hidden away.

When you have got an answer, give it; do not point the finger at a body that is outnumbered 2 to 1. Do not say you do not have an answer, because the real thing is, you do not know which questions the public is asking because you do not have the answers.

### NATIONAL CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT MONTH

(Mr. BIAGGI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to designate the month of August as "National Child Support Enforcement Month."

I introduced similar legislation in 1983, which served as a catalyst for the 1984 child support enforcement amendments—monumental legislation which provided the means necessary to enforce and collect child support payments. It is my hope that the legislation I am introducing today can have the same success. There was some progress after the enactment of the 1984 law but certainly not enough. It is time to renew our commitment to resolving this problem.

Today there are some 8.7 million single parent families, where the mother is the parent. In 42 percent of these families, child support was never awarded. Of those awarded child support, only half ever receive their full entitlement and one-quarter never receive any payment.

In the most recent year we have data for, 1983, \$10.1 billion was owed in child support, of this only 70 percent was ever paid. This left over 3 million children without child support. This is a national disgrace.

We have come far in the goal of providing adequate and accurate child support, but we still have far to go. Our Nation's public assistance roster contains many families who need not be dependent if the parent contributed child support. This is a disgrace both to the parent who is shirking his/her responsibility and for the family who must rely on Federal charity for shelter and food.

This Congress, as we are examining the reform of our welfare system, let us ensure the enforcement of child support awards as well as ensuring that child support is awarded wherever it's due. A positive step in this direction is "Child Support Enforcement Month."

I call upon President and Mrs. Reagan, who have been leaders in this

June 10, 1987

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — Extensions of Remarks

E 2315

INDIA'S AID TO TAMIL  
TERRORISTS DEPLORABLE

## HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1987

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Times has been and remains a leader in the media for thorough, relevant, and interesting coverage of international terrorism. In an important staff editorial of June 9, the Times detailed the antidemocratic policies and abhorrent practices of Tamil terrorists. Some of the material aid received by these separatists in the democratic state of Sri Lanka is being provided, directly and with considerable fanfare, by the National Government of India. For one democracy to do such a thing to another is remarkable and disturbing.

Members of the House will want to give the following editorial several moments of consideration.

[From the Washington Times, June 9, 1987]

## RUNNING INTERFERENCE—AND INTERFERING

What on earth is going on in Sri Lanka?

The Island of Sri Lanka is a small bastion of free-market democracy situated 18 miles off the southeastern coast of the Indian subcontinent. On that Indian subcontinent are more than fifty million ethnic Tamil Hindus, most of whom are concentrated in the state of Tamil Nadu. Tamil Nadu lies just across the Palk Strait from Sri Lanka. Sri Lanka itself, whose total population is 16 million, contains approximately another 2.7 million Tamil Hindus. Two-thirds of these are concentrated in the northern and northeastern extremities of the island, where they are blessed with the strategic advantage of being able to reach out and touch their Indian-national brothers with outboard motors and small fishing boats.

Tamil Nadu is governed by a Sri Lankan-born Tamil by the name of M.G. Ramachandran. Mr. Ramachandran quite lustily supports a Marxist terrorist Tamil insurgency that operates in Sri Lanka and is headquartered in Madras, the capital of Tamil Nadu.

The Tamil Tigers, as the guerrillas are called, are so predatory that they have even gobbled up their own comrades-in-terror, seeking complete hegemony of what they envision as a Marxist monopoly of the Sri Lankan future. They now openly speak not just of separatism but of complete conquest. "There will be no democracy when we come to power," said one Tamil spokesman. Mr. Y. Yogi, a Tamil Tiger philosopher, elaborates on the thought, "We will tell the people we want a one-party system. A multi-party system won't work. . . . In a one-party system, when you implement a program, the other parties cannot change it." Mr. Yogi's hangout, the Tiger headquarters in Madras, India, is decorated with posters of Lenin and Che Guevara and photographs of mutilated people.

Mutilation is a primary instrument of Tamil rebel politics. In February, for example, the Tigers crept into the village of Arantalawa and rounded up 28 Sinhalese Buddhists, 8 of whom were children. The hostages were corraled at gunpoint and then hacked to death by axes.

The Tamil Marxists have good tutors in terror. When Israeli forces moved into Southern Lebanon in 1982 they captured a number of Tamils who were being trained by George Habash's Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine. These are the folks who introduced the concept of skyjacking

into the Palestinian vocabulary of armed struggle. The indication is that there are several PFLP-run camps in the Middle East involved in training the Tamils; while Muammar Qaddafi has made the Sri Lankan rebels a most favored charity. The bulk of the Tamil funding, however, comes from the sale of Pakistani heroin transported in Western Europe by Sri Lankan middlemen.

The most disturbing element of the Tamil insurgency is that none of it would be possible were it not for the tacit approval of the Indian government. The war materiel flowing into northern Sri Lanka comes off the beaches of Tamil Nadu, India, and nowhere else.

Two years ago Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi seemed admirably committed to a peaceful resolution to Sri Lanka's conflict when he brokered a peace conference in the Himalayan nation of Bhutan. The talks moved towards a compromise wherein the Tamils would gain limited autonomy but not secession. They ended when the Tigers assassinated two Tamil moderates who supported the agreement. In 1986 the Tigers unilaterally rejected another compromise offer in which they would have been allowed to run unopposed in the initial elections of the would-be, semi-autonomous northern provinces.

Now Mr. Gandhi, always mindful of the inherent fissiparous tendencies in his inherited democracy, is bending to the will of Mr. Ramachandran, Tamil Nadu's Sri Lankan-born governor. The current, highly theatrical campaign to bombard northern Sri Lanka with humanitarian aid is Mr. Ramachandran's idea. It is a powerful symbol. But it is also a lie. The deadly supply line continues unabated.

The United States currently sends no military aid to the democratic government of Sri Lanka. We should remember that if the Tamil Tigers succeed in their goal of creating a one-party state around the strategic port of Trincomalee there will be nothing we can do to prevent them from inviting the Soviets to share in their good fortune.

SUPPORT ARIAS PEACE  
PROPOSAL

## HON. STEPHEN L. NEAL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1987

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, Congress has a great opportunity to make a real and positive step toward a peaceful settlement of the conflict in Nicaragua.

A bold diplomatic initiative to halt the hostilities in Central America was advanced early this year by the President of Costa Rica, Oscar Arias. It deserves our strong support.

The Arias proposal, intended to stop the fighting and ensure democracy and security in the region, was considered last March in a meeting of four Central American democracies. The Government of Nicaragua accepted an invitation to meet with the four other countries in Esquipulas, Guatemala, to discuss the proposal.

The Arias proposal contains the following points:

First, amnesty for political and related offenses, monitored by a commission, and dialog with internal opposition groups.

Second, a cease-fire.

Third, a process leading to a democratic representative form of government, with

honest periodic elections and guaranteed civil rights.

Fourth, free and democratic elections, monitored by the OAS, for membership on the newly created Central American Parliament.

Fifth, a suspension of all extra-regional military aid, overt or covert, to insurgent or irregular forces.

Sixth, an end to attempts to destabilize the governments of Central American countries.

Seventh, a reduction of arms.

Eighth, supervision of the plan by the United Nations, the OAS, and the Contadora group.

Ninth, an evaluation of progress by the Presidents of the five Central American countries.

Tenth, economic and cultural agreements which will permit accelerated development.

The Costa Rican peace initiative offers fresh hope that an acceptable agreement can be reached with the Nicaraguan Sandinista government through diplomacy. It deserves the support and encouragement of the United States Government.

In March, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 63, which expresses congressional support for the Arias initiative. My resolution is similar to the Sanford resolution, which the Senate passed overwhelmingly earlier this year. Today, I am proposing my resolution, which is cosponsored by 62 Members of this House, as an amendment to H.R. 1777, the State Department Authorization Act.

There is great debate within Congress over how to achieve our common goals in Central America. However, there is no question that we all prefer a diplomatic solution without further loss of life or the expenditure of vast sums of money.

It is important, therefore Mr. Speaker, that Congress go on record with this amendment as promoting the Arias initiative for solving the conflict. It will help the Arias effort and can make clear to our administration that Congress prefers this approach.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION  
ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1988

SPEECH OF

## HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1987

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2112) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1988 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the U.S. Government, for the intelligence community staff, for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted that through this bill we are finally providing retirement security for certain former spouses of our country's intelligence personnel. Congress has adopted an incremental approach to the whole issue of spouse equity in retirement laws, and this bill is the latest of several to address the issue. But it is a critically important measure, for it closes a big gap in retirement protection for former CIA spouses.

Back in 1982, Congress enacted legislation to provide retirement and survivor benefits to

spouses of CIA personnel in case of divorce. We had heard horror stories of CIA spouses who were impoverished after divorce, having spent their married years accompanying the employee to foreign posts where there was no opportunity for the spouse to work or earn her own retirement benefits.

The 1982 Act was based on the landmark Foreign Service Act and adopted its pro rata a formula for determining spousal benefits. Yet, as good as these two bills were, neither one provided any benefits for the very individuals who needed them most—the spouses who had gone abroad, represented the U.S. Government, and yet were divorced before courts were authorized to award retirement or survivor benefits.

Last year's Intelligence authorization bill recognized that these former spouses were entitled to a survivor annuity. Because the number of former spouses who were not covered by the 1982 Act is relatively small (less than 100 persons according to our best estimates), we were able to provide this benefit without affecting the CIA retiree's annuity at all. It was a terrific step.

This year, we will close the retirement gap for CIA former spouses by providing retirement benefits as though the spouses were covered by the 1982 Act. This bill will not affect any CIA retiree because the benefits will be paid from appropriated funds, not as a share of the retiree's annuity.

#### LOW-INCOME HOUSING DEMAND TO REACH CRISIS LEVEL IN NEAR FUTURE, STUDY SAYS

**HON. LES AUCOIN**

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1987

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Speaker, the following article, from the June 3 Wall Street Journal, points out the growing crisis in section 8 low-income housing. And on this day, when we've taken a major step toward restoring Federal housing policy, I commend it to my colleagues.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 3, 1987]

#### LOW-INCOME HOUSING DEMAND TO REACH CRISIS LEVEL IN NEAR FUTURE, STUDY SAYS

(By Michel McQueen)

WASHINGTON.—The gap between the supply of low-income housing and the number of families needing such housing will soon rise to "crisis-level" proportions, a study by a non-profit group concludes.

The study was sponsored by Neighborhood Reinvestment Corp., a congressionally chartered institution created in 1978 to spur revitalization of low-income neighborhoods and to help maintain a supply of low-income housing. It was written by an associate professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Phillip Clay.

The report concludes that by 1993, there will be 14.3 million low-income households, but only 10.6 million low-rent housing units, a gap of 3.7 million units. By 2003, the gap will be 7.8 million units, which the author says represents housing for about 18 million poor people.

#### THREE MAIN FORCES

The study identifies three main forces behind the projected housing squeeze:

growth in the number of low-income households accompanied by a decline in the number of privately owned, low-cost rental units; expiring federal subsidies for low-income rental housing; and decreased tax incentives resulting from last year's federal tax overhaul. The author says that two-thirds of the nation's low-income housing is privately owned and not subsidized by the federal government.

William Whiteside, executive director of Neighborhood Reinvestment, said that without changes in federal policies, the figures "will mean Americans living in slum conditions, Americans doubling up—what you can call the hidden homeless—and increases in the actual numbers of homeless."

Author Clay said the study calls into question the shift in federal housing policy, accomplished over the past 20 years, from reliance on publicly owned units for poor families to increased dependence on the private sector.

#### PRIVATE-SECTOR PARTICIPATION

"We made a decision, we made a judgment, that the private sector could do the public's work for it. We are now realizing that there's time limit on" private-sector participation, he said. For example, subsidies that allow private developers to end their participation run the risk of having developers seek different investment when the subsidies end. Lawmakers must find a way to ensure a permanent supply of housing for low-income families, Mr. Clay added.

Concern over diminishing availability of low-income, privately owned housing is a mounting concern in Congress, which is considering legislation to place certain restrictions on landlords who try to end their participation in subsidy programs. Some lawmakers also have pressured the Department of Housing and Urban Development to forego planned sales of mortgages held by HUD, saying such sales could increase the chances that poor families will be displaced. But one such sale of 300 mortgages, representing about 40,000 low- to moderate-income housing units, was held yesterday despite protests from Congress.

In the study released yesterday, low-income families are defined as those with incomes of 50% or less of the national median income. In 1983, the base year of the study, that would be an annual income of \$12,000 for a family of four. Low-income units are defined as those with a monthly rent of \$825 or less.

#### TRIBUTE TO BILL SHIPP

**HON. GEORGE (BUDDY) DARDEN**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 1987

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, for three decades, Bill Shipp has been one of the most respected observers of the Georgia political scene. He has been a State editor, city editor, associate editor, perspective editor, and political editor of the Atlanta newspapers. Bill Shipp also has been my friend, even though, or course, we at times have differed on the issues. I also would like to point out that Bill Shipp has been one of my constituents since I came to Congress in 1983.

Bill Shipp now has left his post at the Atlanta Journal and Constitution and become an independent publisher and political analyst. This week, he began appearing twice weekly as a political columnist in my hometown newspaper, the Marietta Daily Journal.

I want to take this opportunity to wish Bill Shipp well in his new endeavors, and to call to the attention of my colleagues his accomplishments over the past three decades. I would like to submit into the RECORD the June 7 column of his long-time associate Jim Minter, who offered a fitting tribute to the career of this outstanding Georgia newspaperman.

#### SHIPP MADE THE PAPER AND THE GOVERNMENT BETTER

I suppose readers grow weary of newspaper people writing in praise of other newspaper people. Probably it's not good form, but after nearly 17 years in harness with Bill Shipp I cannot let his departure pass without a salute and a word of personal thanks.

Shipp has been reporter, state editor, city editor, associate editor, perspective editor and political editor. I've never known one who could fight so hard to get a story, who had more contacts, a larger store of knowledge, or a better sense of politics. My personal debt to him is enormous.

When the newspaper's management, in a decision which charitably can be termed as questionable, shifted me from the relative innocence of the sports department to managing editor of the Constitution, it was Shipp who saved my hide. He knew all the things I didn't, and cheerfully endured the worst of all assignments—working for a boss who knew less than he did.

When politicians and business leaders called for an appointment, they invariably included a discreet inquiry: "By the way, will Bill Shipp be at the meeting?" I knew what they meant.

The adversary relationship between newspapers and government is one of the cornerstones of democracy, although often an irritant to subjects of news coverage. Shipp has been a textbook example of how the relationship results in both better government and better newspapers.

Shipp looks an adversary in the eye, never hides behind a typewriter in the safety of an office. I would describe him as tough as the leather in his old-fashioned wing-tip shoes, but not without compassion. He worked to get news into the paper, not to keep news out of the paper. So he made enemies who were mostly temporary.

Zell Miller once huffed into his office and threatened to crack his nose. George Busbee took delight in tossing him fully clothed into the Mansion pool. Usually, they all left laughing.

Jimmy Carter, not noted for thick skin, felt the sting of his printed arrows. But Shipp has a picture on his wall of two fellows, barefoot and in blue jeans, relaxing in the den of Carter's home in Plains. Not many newspeople have such presidential snapshots on their walls.

One afternoon a long time ago, Shipp asked to be temporarily excused from his city desk duties. He returned after a couple of hours with a story that made the top of the front page: "Jimmy Carter to Run for President." Some in the newsroom laughed over so ridiculous a scoop, but as he usually does, Shipp laughed last.

There was a ringing telephone in the dark hours of an early morning: Shipp calling from a hospital emergency room with the horrifying news that his son had been killed in an automobile accident. Bill endured, and did some of his best work through the pain.

He was point man in the first wave of college journalists in Georgia to speak out on racial issues. As editor of the University of Georgia newspaper, Shipp countered policy and public opinion to support Horace